

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22-27. Claims 3, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22-26 are amended herein, claim 27 is cancelled without prejudice and new claim 28 is added. Claims 1, 2, 5-11, 13, 15, 17-19 and 21 remain cancelled. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 20, 22-26 and 28 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

ELECTION/RESTRICTION:

On page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the invention the claimed invention of claim 27 is directed to a distinct invention than the invention originally claimed. As mentioned herein, claim 27 is cancelled.

Therefore, withdrawal of the restriction is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101:

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Claim 16 is amended herein.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

Claims 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,064,982 (Puri).

On page 8 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Puri provides a product choice page containing company and/or partner products where the page is presented automatically after the customers needs have been assessed (see also, FIG. 5 and col. 5, lines 25-35). However, as shown in FIG. 4, the customers' needs are identified by having the customers select from statements expressing a particular product category needed (see, col. 5, lines 1-8). That is, Puri is limited to providing descriptive statements identifying particular product categories such as security, information publishing and communication, and having customers select from the descriptive statements of the product to display statements for customizing products per the customers' needs (e.g., statements (50) displayed only after a customer selects information publishing (52) from the list of product needs).

In contrast to Puri, the present invention provides information of operations implemented by commodities, using which a user selects a desired operation to be attained from using a particular commodity.

Independent claim 3, by way of example, recites, "displaying objects of use identifying specific operations implemented by commodities on a user's terminal" and "acquiring a specification corresponding to at least one object of use selected by a user via the terminal from the table." Claim 3 further recites that "said acquiring [is] subsequent to selection of the at least one object of use indicating a desired operation from the displayed objects of use of the commodities." Each of independent claims 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22 recite similar features.

Claims 23 and 24 recite that the usage information displayed to the user identifies "specific operations implemented by the commodities" for retrieving a commodity "subsequent to a user's selection of a desired operation from the usage information." Independent claims 25 and 26 recite similar features.

Puri does not teach or suggest retrieving a commodity "subsequent to" a user's selection from displayed objects of use "identifying specific operations implemented by commodities", as recited in each of the independent claims 3, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22-26.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Puri.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Puri. For example, claim 4 recites that "a specification corresponding to the at least one object of use" selected by the user is retrieved via a network where "the network is Internet". The Puri does not teach or suggest retrieval of "a specification corresponding to object of use" based on selection from object of use identifying specific operation of commodities, as recited in claim 4 (see also claim 3 from which claim 4 depends).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 28 has been added to recite, "determining a commodity meeting a need of a user in response to a selection from operations implemented by components of commodities by the user" and "retrieving a list of commodities matching a desired operation selected from said

operations by the user subsequent to said determining and allowing the user select a commodity from the list."

Puri is limited to displaying statements related to particular products (i.e., user must know category of a product to select the product), and thus does not teach or suggest "retrieving a list of commodities matching a desired operation selected from said operations by the user subsequent to said determining and allowing the user select a commodity from the list", as recited in claim 28.

It is submitted that new claim 28 is patentably distinguishable over Puri.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 08/04/2006

By: 
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501